

## Response to Objections and Rejections

Claims 23 to 28 are presently active in the application.

Claims 23 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The rejection is believed to be overcome by the amendment provided. Claims 23 and 26 have been amended to replace “it” with “said opening”. Hence, the claims as amended overcome that rejection.

The claims 23 and 26 have also been rejected (apparently under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph or second paragraph) with the indication that there is failure to provide antecedent basis for the term “superior surface”. Attention is invited to the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the specification and to the last paragraph of page 8, which, under discussion of figure 1, identifies the superior surface. Hence, it is believed the term has antecedent basis in the specification and, as now presented, in the claims.

Claims 22 and 25 (and 26?) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Cho (U.S. Patent 5,622,497) and Huffman (U.S. Patent 5,788,489). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Cho teaches an articulator narrowing at the end of an opening to the inferior surface of the articulator. The narrowing is to accommodate an extension of a pin. As shown in the drawing of the instant invention (figures 16 and 17) the opening is tapered continuously. If it were not, it would not facilitate extraction of the molding material from the mold. Cho teaches no such continuous tapering. Neither does Huffman teach such tapering of any opening, though Huffman does show some projections from the surface of his tray. Hence, Cho or Cho in combination with

Huffman can not be deemed to render the instantly claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable in over Cho and Huffman and, further, in view of Kuperman. The rejection is traversed, since claim 24 is dependent on claim 23 and requires the continuously tapering opening, which is not suggested or taught in any of the cited references.

Claims 26 through 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for reasons given as to claims 23 through 25. The rejection is traversed as stated above because no reference or combination thereof renders the continuously tapering opening obvious or even suggested.

It is believed the claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims as presented is deemed appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenna Hendricks, Reg., No. 32,535